Mr. A. B. Salem.—It has been seconded by Mr. C. J. Mathew.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—Standing Order 24 says that an amendment which has been moved shall be seconded, not a motion. Every amendment which shall be moved shall be seconded.

President.—There is this specific provision in respect of amendments.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—A resolution cannot be discussed unless it is seconded. Then with reference to the introduction stage there is a specific provision made for seconding.

President.—"If a motion for leave to introduce is opposed."

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—It is only then that votes will have to be taken.

President.—Nothing is said there about seconding.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—I think the Member for Vellarappalli is right.

President.—I think so, because there is no express provision. This also may be taken as a ruling. In connection with motions for leave to introduce a Bill, it is not necessary that it should be seconded.

Question proposed; That leave may be given to introduce the Cochin Limitation Regulation Amendment Bill"

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. K. P Kannan Nayar's Cochin Marumakkathaym Bill.

President.—Now Mr. Kannan Nayar will move the Marumakkathayam Bill.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—I beg leave of the House to introduce the Cochin Marumakkathayam Bill.

Mr. V. K. Kochunni Menon.—I do not understand the object of the Bill now. On that ground I oppose it

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—It is rather strange that at this stage it is opposed.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—It has been a well-established convention of this House that leave for introducing a Bill cannot be opposed.

Mr. V. K. Kochunni Menon.—As it is I cannot but oppose it. If it cannot be opposed now then, this provision itself of making a motion may be taken away.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—I move for closure. If he is to oppose it the mover may have to speak.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—If I can satisfy him that there is necessity for this, then he is not for opposing it.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—I rise to a point of order. It has been a well-established convention of this House that leave to introduce a Bill is not generally opposed.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

President.—If some Member choses to bring in an unnecessary and absurd Bill, are we to allow it? The convention must no doubt be respected. But in cases where we have to depart from that convention we have to do it.

Mr. A B. Salem.—If it is opposed—the opposition may come from any quarter—then it becomes more necessary to publish it, so that the opinion of the country may be taken on it. Therefore, it is, that I am submitting that this opposition, if any, should come after the Bill is actually published, and I submit that, in view of the convention already established, this House would not like to hear any discussion now.

President.—Either the mover may convince the opposer that the opposition is not right, or the opposer may convince the mover that there is no necessity for it, in which case the whole thing will go.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—When Mr. Achyuta Menon, the Hon'ble Member for Mulakunnathukavu, objected to the Hindu Religious Endowments Bill, it was opposed even from the initial stage and this House was not prepared to hear it. Somebody may think it is unnecessary and would begin to oppose it from the time of introduction.

President.—When a Member says that the rule gives him the right and he wants to exercise it, shall I oppose it by saying the convention is the other way? There is the convention. It is open to them to respect it and to give effect to it. In this particular case, he is not following the convention and wants to exercise his right to oppose, which he has, if the President permits him.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—The Member opposing may speak. We have no objection. The Party has also got that convention. It will be open for the Party to move for closure. The Party is not going to depart from the convention.

Mr. V. K. Kochunni Menon.—I do not belong to the Party.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—Therefore, I say I want to move for closure.

Mr. T. K. Krishna Menon.—Apart from the merits of this opposition or its demerits, I wish to know whether it is possible to have a convention contrary to the rule of the Council Law. Standing Order 30 says that there might be opposition and, when there is opposition it states that, after a brief explanatory statement from the Member who moves and from a Member who opposes, the President may without further debate put the question thereon. In other assemblies also, opposition is made at this stage and on that account some Bills are thrown out also.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. A. B. Salem.—That is the reason why I got up and said I move for closure. The question may be put.

President.—Closure is applied when the debate has been going on for a long time and there have been two many speeches. Nothing of that kind has taken place. Go on, Mr. Kannan Nayar.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—I am only surprised that opposition is raised at this stage. No doubt the rule contemplates opposition. But the rule also says that when the matter is opposed only a short explanatory statement is allowed by the President by the mover as well as the opposing Member. Now, as the Member for Jews pointed out, it has been in fact a convention, and a well-meaning convention I would say, because the principles of the Bill and the general provisions are fully discussed only when it is actually introduced, that is, at the second stage. Now I am really surprised that the opposition comes at this stage. The very object of this Regulation, as is seen from the preamble itself, is to make the provisions of the Marumakkathayam Regulation, *i. e.*, the Nayar Regulation, applicable to the other members in the land who are actually following this Marumakkathayam law. It is strange that the Hon'ble Member, who is benefitted by the Nayar Regulation, should stand up and oppose this Regulation. If there are any benefits conferred by the Nayar Regulation, should they not be conferred upon the other communities who are governed by the Marumakkathayam Law? If he is speaking as the spokesman of any particular community which follows the Marumakkathayam Law that they do not want this Regulation, I can well understand it. This is not the first time that this Bill is sought to be introduced. Even during the last Council Mr. Padmanabha Menon wanted to introduce this Bill, but on the date this was taken up he was absent and then the Council closed. And then I am not the only person who has given notice of this Bill. Mr. Ramachandra Ayyar who belongs to a different community and who is not governed by the Marumakkathayam Law has given notice for the introduction of this Bill. So that I would only appeal to that Member who is opposing it not to oppose at this stage and to withdraw the opposition. After leave is given, we will go into the whole question and see whether a large number of communities who are likely to be affected by this Bill have any opposition. I do not think it is after all such a controversial Bill and a revolutionary measure. Because the object is so far as the marriage law is concerned, so far as the management of the *tarawad* is concerned, so far as the question of inheritance is concerned, So far as the question of partition is concerned,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

there is no codified fixed law now; there are only rules, conventions and usages now. The Marumakkathayam Law applicable to the Nayars has been codified. I want if possible to extend those provisions to the other communities also. If there is any individual or any member of a community or any number of Members belonging to different communities who want to be excluded, there is ample provision made in the Nayar Regulation. I, therefore, appeal to the good sense of the Member who is opposing not to press the matter to a division. That is all what I want to submit at this stage.

Mr. V. K. Kochunni Menon.—I oppose. There is a section even among the Nayars who think that the Nayar Regulation is not beneficial, They think that the Nayar Regulation has brought about more harm than good.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—You can repeal it.

Mr. V. K. Kochunni Menon.—I am not aware of any other community who are desirous of having such a Regulation.

President.—Some of the Wariars, for instance, wanted this.

Mr. V. K. Kochunni Menon.—And some of the Namboodiris also; but what became of the Bill that was passed by the Council? It is only for ascertaining whether there is any real necessity—whether those other communities who follow the Marumakkathayam Law desire to have such a law—that I oppose this. My friend does not say that any of those communities desires to have such a law. That is the only ground on which I oppose it.

President.—So you want this to be put to the vote?

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—Even at this stage I entreat the Hon'ble Member to withdraw the opposition and not to bring the matter to a division.

Mr. V. K. Kochunni Menon.—It may be put to the vote.

Question proposed.—That the motion for leave to introduce "Mr. Kannan Nayar's Cochin Marumakkathayam Bill be passed."

(Question put and agreed to, Government voting for the same.)

Point of order re: the right to ask questions.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—Before we pass on to the next item I have a regretful complaint to make. Of course, I do it with all the seriousness of it, and in the absolute interest of the harmonious working of this Council. Yesterday, I had the unfortunate position to move myself out of the Council, because I found that the rules to which I was appealing were not allowed to be read by the Deputy President on a point of order. I wanted to make certain observations and get certain explana-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly